

**FILED**

**DECEMBER 14, 2007**

**KAREN S. MITCHELL  
CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT**

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
AMARILLO DIVISION

CLEVELAND EUGENE RATCLIFF,

Petitioner,

v.

NATHANIEL QUARTERMAN, Director,  
Texas Department of Criminal Justice,  
Correctional Institutions Division,

Respondent.

§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§

2:07-CV-0270

**REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION TO DENY PETITION  
FOR A WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS BY A PERSON IN STATE CUSTODY**

Petitioner has filed with this Court a Petition for a Writ of Habeas Corpus by a Person in State Custody challenging the result of a prison disciplinary proceeding held July 9, 2007 at the Clements Unit in Potter County, Texas. For the reasons set forth below, petitioner's habeas application should be DENIED.

**NO LOSS OF GOOD TIME CREDITS AND  
INELIGIBLE FOR MANDATORY SUPERVISED RELEASE**

In order to challenge a state prison disciplinary adjudication by way of a federal petition for a writ of habeas corpus, a petitioner must, at a minimum, be eligible for mandatory release *and* have received a punishment sanction which included forfeiture of previously accrued good time credits. *See Malchi v. Thaler*, 211 F.3d 953, 958 (5<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2000). In his habeas application, petitioner advises he is in respondent's custody pursuant to convictions for the felony offenses of aggravated robbery and possession of a controlled substance out of the Criminal District Court No. 5, Dallas County, Texas, and the resulting 40-year and 10-year concurrent sentences assessed pursuant to said convictions. In his

application, petitioner acknowledges that, for his aggravated robbery conviction, there was a finding that he used or exhibited a deadly weapon. Petitioner also concedes he is not eligible for mandatory supervised release. Petitioner is not eligible for mandatory supervised release under section 508.149(a)(1) and (a)(12) of the Texas Government Code. As petitioner is not eligible for mandatory supervised release, he is not entitled to any federal habeas corpus relief.

On the form petition, petitioner concedes he did not lose any previously accrued good time credits as a result of the July 9, 2007 disciplinary case. As petitioner did not forfeit any previously accrued good time credits, petitioner is not entitled to federal habeas corpus relief and his petition should be DENIED.

#### RECOMMENDATION

It is the RECOMMENDATION of the United States Magistrate Judge to the United States District Judge that the Petition for a Writ of Habeas Corpus by a Person in State Custody filed by petitioner CLEVELAND EUGENE RATLIFF be DENIED.

#### INSTRUCTIONS FOR SERVICE

The United States District Clerk is directed to send a copy of this Report and Recommendation to each party by the most efficient means available.

IT IS SO RECOMMENDED.

ENTERED this 14th day of December 2007.

  
CLINTON E. AVERITTE  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

**\* NOTICE OF RIGHT TO OBJECT \***

Any party may object to these proposed findings, conclusions and recommendation. In the event a party wishes to object, they are hereby NOTIFIED that the deadline for filing objections is eleven (11) days from the date of filing as indicated by the “entered” date directly above the signature line. Service is complete upon mailing, Fed. R. Civ. P. 5(b)(2)(B), or transmission by electronic means, Fed. R. Civ. P. 5(b)(2)(D). When service is made by mail or electronic means, three (3) days are added after the prescribed period. Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(e). Therefore, any objections must be **filed on or before the fourteenth (14<sup>th</sup>) day after this recommendation is filed** as indicated by the “entered” date. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b); R. 4(a)(1) of Miscellaneous Order No. 6, as authorized by Local Rule 3.1, Local Rules of the United States District Courts for the Northern District of Texas.

Any such objections shall be made in a written pleading entitled “Objections to the Report and Recommendation.” Objecting parties shall file the written objections with the United States District Clerk and serve a copy of such objections on all other parties. A party’s failure to timely file written objections to the proposed findings, conclusions, and recommendation contained in this report shall bar an aggrieved party, except upon grounds of plain error, from attacking on appeal the unobjected-to proposed factual findings, legal conclusions, and recommendation set forth by the Magistrate Judge in this report and accepted by the district court. *See Douglass v. United Services Auto. Ass’n*, 79 F.3d 1415, 1428-29 (5th Cir. 1996); *Rodriguez v. Bowen*, 857 F.2d 275, 276-77 (5th Cir. 1988).